



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Eirubin Daf Chuf

- **Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, if a chatzer opens into the area around a well enclosed by boards, may one transfer items between the chatzer and the enclosed area? **Rabbah** said it is mutar (no eiruv need be made, because the enclosed area is not considered to be owned by another individual). **Abaye** asked, what if there are 2 chatzeiros that open into the enclosed area, is it still permitted? **Rabbah** answered it is assur, as we see that **R' Huna** prohibited transferring in this case, even if there is access between the two chatzeiros besides via the enclosed area around the well, because people outside will not realize there is additional access between the 2 chatzeiros, and they will think that transfer between the chatzeiros via the enclosed area is allowed because a "shituf" was made between the chatzeiros and the enclosed area. The problem with that is that a "shituf" was only instituted for a mavui (which must have 3 walls, and must be longer than it is wide, both of which the enclosed area is not). As a gezeirah to prevent that from happening, it is assur to transfer between these areas. **Rava** says there is no gezeirah, and therefore if there is access between the chatzeiros directly, transfer between the chatzeiros and the enclosed area would be allowed.
 - **Q: Abaye** brought a Braisa that clearly says that when there is direct access between the chatzeiros, transferring between them and the enclosed area is permitted. This is problematic for **R' Huna**!? **A: R' Huna** would say that the case of the Braisa is where there is access directly between the chatzeiros that is easily visible to the people in the reshus harabim. In that case there is no reason for the gezeirah.
- **Q: Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, if the water in the well dried up on Shabbos, does it become assur to carry in the enclosed area? **A: Rabbah** answered, the boards are considered "walls" only because we are lenient to allow access to water. If the water is gone, the leniency doesn't apply and it is assur to carry in the enclosed area.
 - **Q: Ravin** asked, what if the water dries up on Shabbos and then water returns to the well on Shabbos (e.g. it rained). Is carrying in the enclosed area allowed? **A: Abaye** answered, if the water dries up, **Rabbah** taught that it is assur. If the water returns, it is like the walls were put in place on Shabbos, and the halacha is that walls put in place on Shabbos are considered to be full walls.
 - **Q: A Braisa** says that **R' Nachman** said, walls put in place on Shabbos only create a reshus hayachid l'chumra (one who transfers into it will be chayuv, but one may not carry inside the enclosed area created by these walls)!? **A: R' Nachman** said his halacha with regard to walls that were put in place b'mezid. Here, the rain fell, which "created" the walls on their own.
- **R' Elazar** says, one who transfers from a reshus harabim into the area around a well enclosed by boards is chayuv.
 - **Q: This is obvious!** If it wasn't a reshus hayachid D'Oraisa, the **Rabanan** would not allow one to carry there!? **A: He** meant that if one encloses an area of the reshus harabim, not around a well, with boards, it still has a din as a reshus hayachid.
 - **Q: That is also obvious!** If it didn't, the **Rabanan** couldn't be lenient and allow this arrangement around a well?! **A: He** meant that it is considered a reshus hayachid even though throngs of people walk through this area.

MUTAR L'HAKRIV L'BE' AIR...

- **Q: A Mishna** says that a person may not stand in one reshus and drink from a cup in another reshus unless he brings his head and most of his body into the reshus where the cup is. What is the halacha with regard to giving an animal to drink? Does its head and most of its body need to be in the reshus hayachid with you or not? It is clear that if you are holding the pail with the

water for the animal to drink, but not holding onto the animal itself (to prevent it from turning its head into the reshus harabim) that the head and most of the animal needs to be in the reshus with you. But, if you are holding onto the animal, must the head and most of the body be in the reshus? **A:** The Mishna says that the area around the well must be large enough to fit the animal's head and most of its body. Presumably the Mishna is discussing where the person is holding onto the animal and it still requires the head and most of the body to be within the reshus!

- It could be that the Mishna is discussing where he is NOT holding onto the animal, and that is why most of the animal needs to be in the reshus.
- **Q:** If he is not holding onto the animal, it would not be mutar!? A Braisa says that one may not give an animal to drink around a well, but must pour the water into a trough or something for the animal to drink. That is talking where the animal is not being held, and we see it is assur!? **A: Abaye** explained that Braisa as not talking about a typical case. It is discussing a case where a trough in a reshus hayachid sticks into the enclosed area around the well. The Braisa is saying that he must pour the water into the trough and not carry the pail of water over the trough to the animal, because we are afraid that he may put the pail down in the reshus harabim and then lift it to carry to the animal, thereby transferring into a reshus hayachid. However, in a typical case, it may be permitted to give an animal to drink without holding onto the animal as long as most of it is in the reshus with you.
 - Another version of the original question was whether it even helps to have most of the animal's body in the reshus, or is that something that only helps by people? When holding the animal, having most of the body is clearly enough, the question would be when not holding the animal. The Gemara tries to bring an answer from our Mishna that says most of the animal must be within the reshus, and presumably we are discussing where he is holding the animal. The Gemara says that is not a proof, because the Mishna may be discussing where he is not holding the animal. The Gemara then asks the question from the Braisa quoted above and gives the same answer.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that one may force-feed a camel when its head and most of its body are within the reshus hayachid. To force-feed one must hold the animal, yet we see that most of the body must still be in the reshus!? **A: R' Acha bar R' Huna in the name of R' Sheishes** says, a camel is different because of its long neck. It may be that another animal which is being held does not need most of its body to be in the reshus.